

**LAKE COUNTY**  
**CAPITAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**REVISED MEETING MINUTES – June 9, 2011**

---

**County Commission Liaison:** Commissioner Sean Parks, District 2

**Members Present:** Davis Talmage, Banking and Finance  
Bill Benham, Agricultural Industry Representative  
Linda Nagle, Home Builders Association of Lake County  
Carol MacLeod, Lake County Schools  
John Buxman, Chamber of Commerce  
Jim Richardson, League of Cities  
Nancy Hurlbert, Citizen at Large  
Jeffrey Banker, Citizen at Large  
Alan Winslow, Citizen at Large

**Staff Present:** David Heath, Deputy County Manager  
Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney  
Jim Stivender, Jr., Director of Public Works Department  
Bobby Bonilla, Director of Parks & Trails  
Tom Merchant, Lake County Library Services  
Angi Thompson, Development Processing Manager  
Phyllis Hegg, Assistant to Jim Stivender  
Cheryl Sutherland, Office Associate III  
Jack Fillman, Assistant Chief of Administration, Department of Public Safety

**Citizen Present:** Vance Jochim

**Media Present:** Liv Stanford, Daily Sun

Chairman Talmage called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and welcomed back Nancy Hurlbert. He noted that the meeting had been duly advertised and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2011 Impact Fee/Capital Facilities Advisory Committee meeting.

***MOTION was made by Nancy Hurlbert and SECONDED by Jeffrey Banker to approve the May 26, 2011 minutes of the Lake County Impact Fee Committee. Motion carried.***

**Old Business:** Angi Thompson handed a report to members showing permitting activity for the Road Impact Fee Suspension/Residential (covering periods 3/2/09 through 3/1/10 and 3/2/10 through 3/1/11), and for the Road Impact Fee Suspension/Commercial (covering periods 3/2/9 through 3/1/10 and 3/2/10 through 3/1/11). Bill Benham advised these reports were asked for due to the suspension of impact fees on transportation and whether or not it made a difference in anymore activity in the County. These reports will be discussed further at the next meeting.

**Commissioner Parks** – Commissioner Parks updated the committee on the June 7<sup>th</sup> BCC meeting; after hearing concerns on efficiency and cost effective as possible with the budget, he asked to be placed on the agenda for a 'Operational and Efficiency Audit' of the Public Works Dept., which the BCC will address in the near future. An Operational/Efficiency Audit is different than a financial audit, as it will be detailed and examine redundancies with other departments such as Growth Management Dept., and how it interrelates with the MPO. This will be done independently and show that the BCC is making good use of the tax dollar. Commissioner Parks stated he will keep the committee updated and should have more information at the next meeting and encourage any input. A budget presentation will be made to the committee as a whole, and looking to take presentation on the road (similar to the 'LPA' presentations done years ago), so individuals can interact and see what is being done with the budget, since it is an important issue. Commissioner Parks will be leaving the meeting early today, due to a workshop on water related issues in South Lake with the Director of the St. Johns Water River Management District.

He encouraged the committee, as they review today's presentation on 'The Impact Fee Study Update' by Duncan and Associates, to look at all options presented. The BCC will look at how roads are prioritized and will interact with the committee within the next few months.



## **Commissioner Parks (continued) -**

Commissioner Parks stated that on Tues. June 7<sup>th</sup>, the Minneola Council agreed to a proposal with Lake County for the 'Minneola Athletic Complex'. Lake County will manage the park; make improvements and upgrades, which will address the need for fields and facilities in South Lake. This will be cost effective and reasonable prices for local citizens and assured that the fields will be available to them.

Alan Winslow asked clarification of 'prioritizing' within the committee or as a commission prioritizing the budget. Commissioner Parks advised the BCC will be prioritizing within the road projects and will address through the MPO, and continue to talk within the next few months. Mr. Winslow also asked what timeline the 'road shows' would be and Commissioner Parks stated within this budget cycle – within the next 90-days.

Bill Benham asked what the timeline for the Public Works audit would be and if a consultant had already been chosen. Commissioner Parks advised a date had not been set, but it would be soon, and a consulting firm has not been chosen, as the scope is still being shaped.

## **New Business: Presentation by Clancy Mullen, Duncan and Associates, - 'Impact Fee Study Update'**

Angi Thompson advised for those that had previously viewed the presentation before, they started with the road portion of the presentation and then talked about the other impact fees. Ms. Thompson believes since the road portion of the presentation will generate the most discussion, she asked Clancy Mullen of Duncan and Associates to rearrange the presentation and do Fire, Park and Library first, so those staff members that are here can leave afterwards and we can continue into the major discussion of impact fees. Mr. Mullen, Duncan and Associates, is the consultant that completed this study. He will go over the study, methodology, results and available for questions. Staff members from each of the departments responsible for impact fees are present for questions, as well.

Mr. Mullen advised the June 2010 study was revised with a few minor changes and completed in April 2011. Handouts were provided to committee members of the study. He advised that in addition to Duncan and Associates, they are a planning/consulting firm out of Austin, Texas. His boss, Jim Duncan was the Growth Management Director in Broward County for several years before going to Texas. Duncan and Associates handles a lot of impact fees within the State of Florida.

## **Transportation Impact Fees**

- Last updated in 2002 (based on 2001 study by Tindale Oliver & Associates)
- Fees are based on a 10 year old study
- A 2007 update was done by Tindale & Oliver but was not updated
- Fees were suspended for 2-years (before update came out in June 2010) and been on hold.

## **Parks/Library/Fire & Rescue Fees**

- Last updated in 2003 (based on study by Henderson Young)

## **Schools**

- Not dealing with in this update / Suspended for 15-months effective January 1, 2011.

## **Refresher on Fundamentals of Impact Fees**

- Impact Fees are for 'capital only' – not operating costs
- Should be based on existing level of service, not a desired higher level of service
- New development should not be double charged, as new development will generate new taxes and pay fees.
- If there is debt on existing facilities within level of service, credit should be given. New development will be paying for maintaining level of service and paying property taxes that will retire debt on existing facilities, and therefore paying twice.
- Henderson and Young takes different approach regarding schools, saying if the school is full then it is not double charging, as they are not paying twice for new schools for growth.
- Credits are given for grants / dedicated funding that is available. New development is generating, if you have money that is dedicated for park land acquisition, you should be given credit as well.



### Major Characteristics of Update

- Simplify land use categories (changes philosophy and approach – not methodology)
- Retain consumption-based methodology; made a few changes by calibrating travel demand factors used in road fees. A major change was made to Fire & Rescue by including annualized costs (example: paying for the fire trucks needed throughout their life).
- Proposes modifying road benefit districts from 6 to 3
- Updates costs and credits (calculating credit options for transportation funding alternatives)
- Updates to administrative fees
- Proposes automatic annual indexing for inflation

### Service Areas vs. Benefit Districts

- Service area is where fee applies (Transportation-countywide; Parks-unincorporated; Library-countywide excluding Eustis. Fire & Rescue fee applies in fire district (unincorporated area, Astatula, Howey-in-the-hills and part of Lady Lake).
- Benefit Districts for Library and Fire & Rescue is the same as service area, but Transportation and Parks is divided into number of benefit districts. Money collected in the benefit district is spent in that district. Countywide fee calculation – segregate money collected in spend in different areas.

### PARK IMPACT FEE UPDATE

- Included public lands program purchases; little effect on fee (\$30.1 million value mostly offset by \$29.8 million debt). Gives County flexibility to spend fees to improve public lands.
- Used average cost per acre from public lands. Cost has come down to under \$15,000 an acre versus \$17,000 to \$19,000 per acre in 2003 study, based on public land purchases.
- Provided credits for debt, sales tax and grant funding. The 2003 study gave 10% credit. If you take out the credit for public lands, the credit is 30% and is a major factor in calculation and major difference in study.
- Consistent use of service unit. In 2003 study, level of service was based on population (fee based on average number of people in occupied units). Update – level of service and fee based on equivalent dwelling units (EDUs).
  - **Park Current Fee Comparison**
    - Single-Family - \$222; Potential Fee - \$507 --- change of \$285
    - Compared to other counties, park fees are very low. The potential fee is higher, but lower than what other communities charge. Note: Polk County suspended their fees until 7/12/11.

### LIBRARY IMPACT FEE UPDATE

- Level of service increased since study was done in 2003. Square footage per capita increased 18%.
- Construction cost based on three new libraries; Cost per square foot was \$246 versus \$122 per square foot used in 2003 study.
- Collection cost based on recent purchases and increased to \$22 per item versus \$12 per item in 2003 study.
- Land cost was based on Cagans Crossing Library purchase (approximately \$1 per square foot). Land costs are not a huge component of Library fee, but it does have some effect.
- Consistent use of service unit. 2003 study the level of service was based on total population, and fee based on average size. In update, level of service and fee based on equivalent dwelling units (EDUs).
  - **Library Current Fee Comparison**
    - Single-Family - \$191; Potential Fee - \$406 --- change of \$215
    - Current fees do not apply in Eustis (not part of library system)
    - Proposed fees should not apply in Leesburg (paying through debt service payments)
    - Polk County has a fee but is suspended until 7/31/12. Lake County is only one in area. Current fee is same as Florida average. Updated fee calculated would place Lake County within national average.



Alan Winslow asked how the study justifies the difference in rates (example: mobile home parks versus a dog community). Mr. Mullen advised it is based on number of household size for parks and libraries. Jim Richardson stated that he does not understand how this would work for manufactured homes, as there is a significant difference in school impact fees for site building and manufactured homes. He knows just as many children live in manufactured homes than site building ones. Mr. Mullen stated it is not whether it is a manufactured home or site built, but if it is in a mobile home park or on its own lot. A manufactured home on a single-family lot is treated like a single-family home. Alan Winslow asked if most manufactured home communities are considered the same as a single-family home and Mr. Mullen advised that manufactured home subdivisions (with individual lot per house) is treated the same as a single-family.

## **FIRE IMPACT FEE UPDATE**

- The 2003 Study used annualized costs. Assuming one fire truck per 10,000 persons, a truck costs \$500,000 and lasts ten years, which equals \$50,000 per year. A new home has three persons and useful life of 28-years. Annualized cost is calculated by \$50,000/year divided by 10,000 persons, which would equal \$5 yearly per person. \$5 yearly per person times three persons times 28-years would equal \$420 per unit.
- The 2010 study uses a one-time capital costs. Assuming one fire truck per 10,000 persons, a truck costs \$500,000, existing level of service equals \$50 per person. A new home with three persons, capital cost would equal \$50 per person times three, therefore \$150 a unit.
- Updated call data on which calls per service (basis for fee schedule) and look at how many calls for last three years for single-family units, multi-family units, etc. Call data changes even with three year average, as it changes over time, as you might errors in land use data and then correct, which then changes. A ratio of two databases that are changing. Mr. Mullen advised he does not prefer using fire calls and would rather use functional population as it is more stable. Large swings occur (see examples below):

### ○ **Fire Current Fee Comparison**

Single Family - \$390	Potential Fee - \$345	Difference - \$(45)
Multi-Family - \$244	Potential Fee - \$218	Difference - \$(26)
Retail/Commercial - \$1,301	Potential Fee - \$390	Difference - \$(911)
Office - \$1,301	Potential Fee - \$135	Difference - \$(1,166)

Lake County Fire Impact Fee is on high end compared to other counties (Polk Co. suspended their fees until 7/31/12), but fee would come down for single-family. When looking at commercial (retail and office), the Fire Impact Fee is very high based on previous study of 2003 and call data used to calculate. If you use the updated fees according to study, the Fire Impact Fee would be in the mid range and closer to the Florida average.

Mr. Mullen suggested that if the County keeps the three fees (Parks, Library and Fire); it ought to be based on the new study. They do not have to be increased, but for Fire in each category the fees would go down. Parks and Library, it would be determined by the BCC at what percent would be used, and therefore be based on most recent data available.

David Heath stated that since impact fees are sensitive to construction costs, what period were the impact fees decided (example: 2004-2005, local governments could not get anyone to bid on jobs, and therefore a huge spike in terms of construction and design; now more reasonable since they have come down)? Mr. Mullen advised that used data that was used a little over a year ago. Mr. Stivender mentioned that Public Works' construction project costs were based on 2008 prices instead of the 2006-2007 prices. Mr. Mullen stated they were all built since the 2007 prices for Libraries. He advised that prices could have come down some within the year since the updated study was done.



## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE UPDATE

- \$2.57 million weighted average cost per lane-mile. Looked at a number of options to base update on such as capital improvement plan, recent data, and took most conservative approach and looked at most recent project of CR466 and based updated study. This was 38% less than the 2007 study (\$4.14 million) done by Tindale Oliver & Associates. But, still 50% higher than the 2001 study (\$1.70 million). Even though prices and costs have come down, they have not come down to be lower than 63% of what was calculated in 2001.
- Travel demand factors over predict actual VMT by 7%. VMT's were calibrated (all development within County is multiplied by the travel demand factors, trip generation rates, and trip lengths, etc., and see how much travel would be expected to be seen on major road system if all is built today. Compare to traffic actually on road system today, and reduced trip lengths by 7%.
- Transportation Alternative Funding Task Force Committee had four recommendations and wanted to see if they were implemented and how it would affect the fee. If 8% is earmarked from the General Fund for road improvements, this would result in a 29% reduction in fee that was calculated; Dedicating new non-residential property tax for 5-years would result in a 4% fee reduction; Adoption of new 0.25 millage MSTU road tax would result in a 11% fee reduction; Adoption of 5-cent/gallon 2<sup>nd</sup> optional gas tax would result in a 12% fee reduction.
- All four funding alternatives added together would result in a 53% fee reduction. Fees would be calculated about the same as the fees that are currently suspended (with all new funding sources).

### Simplified Land Use Categories

- Change in emphasis and not methodology. Current approach is to try and be as accurate and detailed as possible, and maximize your fee revenue. Recommending to simply things and look at long term.
- Be reasonable and look at long term impacts. Shopping centers are based on a mix of uses. Most commercial uses occur in shopping centers. The current fee varies by size of shopping centers, and as they get bigger the trip generation tends to fall, but becomes primary destination with fewer pass-bys, and counteract each other.
- Calibrated to ensure travel on major roads is not over-predicted.
- Administrative advantages is easier classifying new land uses and determine if it is commercial, office, institutional, industrial, warehousing, or if it is a high turn-over restaurant, high-quality restaurant, etc.
- Avoid controversy over high-fee categories.
- Avoid most change-of-use issues (example: small retail dress shop serving coffee, they will not be hit with fees of a restaurant).
- Avoid need for numerous local studies.

### Proposed Land Use Categories

- *Summarization:*

Existing Categories	Proposed Categories
Single-Family / Mobile Home (not in park)	Single-Family
Multi-Family (1-2 stories) / Multi-Family (3+ stories)	Multi-Family
Mobile Home Park	Mobile Home Park
Active Adult Community	Active Adult Community
Hotel / Motel	Lodging
Assisted Care Living Facility / General Recreation-County Park / Schools/ Colleges-Universities / Church / Day Care Center / Cemetery / Library / Hospital / Nursing Home / Airport Hanger / Government Complex-Municipal / Government Complex-County / Fire Station	Public / Institutional
Office (10,000 sq. ft. to over 400,000 sq. ft.) / Single-Tenant Office / Research Center / Medical Office or Clinic / Office Park / Business Park	Office



## Proposed Land Use Categories (continued)

### o *Summarization (continued):*

Existing Categories	Proposed Categories
Retail (50,000 sq. ft. to over 600,000 sq. ft.) / Movie Theater & Matinee / Building Materials & Lumber / Discount Superstores / Home Improvement Superstore / Specialty Retail / Hardware & Paint Store / Wholesale Nursery / New or Used Auto Sales / Supermarket / Convenience Store & Gas Pumps / Pharmacy-Drug Store / Furniture Store / Bank-Savings Drive In / Bank / Quality Restaurant / High Turnover Restaurant / Fast Food-Drive Thru / Bar-Lounge / Quick Lube / Auto Repair-Body Shop / Gas-Service Station / Self Serve Car Wash / Convenience Store-Gas & Food / Stand-Alone Meeting Facility / Veterinarian Clinic / Golf Course / Amusement & Recreational Services / Marina / Horse Training / Racquet Club-Health Spa / Bowling Alley / Health Club-Dance Studio	Retail / Commercial
General Light Industrial / General Heavy Industrial / Industrial Park / Manufacturing / Utilities Building	Industrial / Manufacturing
Warehouse / High-Cube Warehouse (possible consideration / new use)	Warehouse
Mini-Warehouse	Mini-Warehouse

## Transportation Full Cost Comparison

- *Trip generation manual was updated; fees are not consistently different by category, but close to major categories.*

Land Use Type	Unit	2001 Update	2007 Update	2010 Update	% Change From:	
					2001	2007
Single Family (1,500 to 2,499 S.F.)	Dwelling	\$3,453	\$11,342	\$4,606	33%	-59%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$2,221	\$5,208	\$2,126	-4%	-59%
Lodging	Room	\$1,751	\$5,472	\$2,238	28%	-59%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 S.F.	\$3,434	\$19,815	\$5,349	56%	-73%
Office	1,000 S.F.	\$3,327	\$11,933	\$4,475	35%	-62%
Manufacturing	1,000 S.F.	\$1,865	\$6,083	\$2,553	37%	-58%
Warehousing	1,000 S.F.	\$2,422	\$7,900	\$2,379	-2%	-70%

Linda Nagle asked where gas stations would be listed on cost comparison. Mr. Mullen advised it would be listed as fueling stations but could not compare in updates study, as it would depend on square footage. Ms. Nagle asked how much the new Race Trac in Eustis pay or was it after fees were suspended and advised it was built after suspension of fees. She asked Angi Thompson if there is an example of one and Ms. Thompson stated that a service station with ten fuel stations would pay approximately \$21,000 in road impact fees under current schedule. Ms. Nagle asked how much banks would pay and advised they would be significantly higher.

Mr. Mullen mentioned that comparing suspended fees to suspended fees, Orange County reduced their transportation fees by 25%. Lake County is currently on low end of for single-family fees, and currently suspended fees for retail.

Alan Winslow asked if there is a comparison for potential revenue collected (for example: 2007 versus 2010 update for projected revenue?), any other words, given a particular building year, he used the 2007 updated fee and used 2010 recommended fee, what would be difference in revenue? Angi Thompson advised this had not been done, but she is tracking what would have been collected under suspension fees. Mr. Winslow stated that the study was basically based on fairness and no consideration of what total revenue generated or what impact would be, and Mr. Mullen agreed and advised that a study was not done on revenue projections. He mentioned if using simplified approach you will get less revenue. Ms. Thompson advised you would get less revenue on the commercial side and a little more on residential side.

### Transportation Benefit District Options

Currently there are six benefit districts, and they have modified plan showing boundary lines so they do not divide the cities into multiple districts. Mr. Mullen suggested combining districts and having only three benefit districts (similar to Parks). Any monies collected under current districts, would have to be spent in those districts; any change like this would only affect future revenue. The advantage of fewer districts would be more flexibility with only three pots of money you can prioritize better.

### Impact Fee Administrative Fee

- Currently, the County charges on top of the impact fee a 3% administrative fee up to a maximum of \$100 per permit.
- The fee was \$100 per permit before fees were suspended (now is \$24 based on 3%). Only collecting administrative fees for Fire, Library and Parks, there is not a lot of new administrative revenue.
- When analysis was done, it was calculated that \$1.3% needed to be collected or \$142 per permit reviewed to cover administrative costs, which was recommended. Analysis is out of date, as revenues are dependent on what fees are charged and if not charging most fees, you are not getting a lot of administrative revenue.

### Annual Inflation Adjustment

- When Impact Fees come back, you might want to consider adjusting fees based on inflation to lessen big jumps between updates.
- There are several indices for transportation, such as producer price index by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (which has been discontinued). The RLB (Construction Cost Quarterly) looks at construction costs like bid costs (including labor). ENR indices capture construction cost increases better than Consumer Price Index. ENR indices are more stable than specialized indices.

### Ordinance Amendments

- Definitions were added to land use categories, and proposed in ordinance draft that there be no staff/administrative determined fees. If someone has a unique use, do an independent fee calculation study and consideration will be given to adding to fee schedule.
- Updated fee schedules and added automatic inflation adjustment (ENR CCI).
- Suggested increase of administrative fee to \$142 per permit received.
- Clarified developer credits for road improvements; only improvements funded in 5-year CIP are eligible. Right of Way must be for roads identified in the comprehensive plan.

### Impact Fee Comparisons

- Fair comparisons are difficult. Impact fees are only small part of up-front development costs.
- Other factors are likely more important than up-front costs. Local market for product or service, tax rates, utility rates, infrastructure, labor market, etc.
- Recent suspensions/reductions have had no apparent effect. Compared amount of fee reduction to rate of building permit issuance year before and after. No statistical difference. Suspensions have not helped growth. A study was done comparing various counties (fee reduction and non-fee reduction) within an 18-month period in which numerous counties reduced their fees significantly, and other counties that did not reduce fees (with some raising their fees). In a period of decline, everyone is issuing fewer permits, but is the reduction more in counties that have kept their fees high? The study found no affect at all, as statistically it does not make a difference. Suspensions have not stimulated growth.
- Lake County is lowest for single-family fees compared to neighboring counties, and only has fire fees for retail. Basically, Lake County is not charging fees for commercial. Growth is happening in Orange and Sumter Counties.



### Questions:

1. **Alan Winslow – Simplified land use categories that were calibrated to ensure travel on major roads was not over predicted. How was it calibrated?** Mr. Mullen stated that existing single-family homes generates so many vehicle miles per day, which is multiplied by same numbers in single-family house. This is done for all land use categories and add up all vehicle miles of travel; an inventory was done of road system and looked at every road to determine number of trips, traffic counts, length of road segment/miles; which is multiplied and added to get actual vehicle miles of travel on road system and compared the two. Based on fee schedule and trip generation rates, they were over predicting by 7% on the amount of travel seen on road system. Mr. Winslow stated that essentially reduction was made on major roads, so there is an assumption that most are using back roads when going to shopping centers. Mr. Mullen advised that they are looking mostly at collector roads and arterial roads for calibration.

Chairman Talmage asked if anyone had any other questions or comments on the presentation, and thanked Mr. Mullen for his time. Chairman Talmage asked if there was any new business the committee would like to discuss, and Alan Winslow asked if there could be an open discussion, and Mr. Talmage agreed.

### General Discussions:

Alan Winslow asked what the target date is to have a recommendation for the BCC and Angi Thompson advised the original timeframe was 6-months based on initial schedule. The committee's next meeting (June 30<sup>th</sup>) would have presentations made by the Public Works Department, Lake-Sumter MPO and the County Budget Office. On July 7<sup>th</sup>, there would be discussions to form a recommendation. Ms. Thompson advised unless there is a need to schedule additional meetings, a recommendation should be ready after the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Talmage stated that he thought the next meeting on June 30<sup>th</sup> was suppose to be possibly a full-day including discussion time and asked if correct. Ms. Thompson agreed and advised the next meeting the committee to talk about any other alternatives or data, obtain presentations from Public Works and Budget Office and discuss as needed.

Mr. Winslow advised that he is obtaining good information, but not sure how much of it is relevant, and concerned about a major decision and would like to get an idea to see how much are we trying to generate, and over next 10-years what is the projection of usage/projection of funds available. He does not feel comfortable in making a decision quickly. Chairman Talmage stated that Commissioner Parks reported the committee has 5-months, and would have some time after that if needed for discussion. Mr. Winslow mentioned that the County Budget is moving to a conclusion and the committee is not ready yet. Mr. Talmage suggested as part of the committee's recommendation they provide the BCC with a 3-part plan over the next two years. David Heath, Deputy County Manager advised that the committee was too late for recommendations to the 2011/2012 budget, as they are in the last part of the budget and the BCC has to set the budget in July, with budget hearings in September. Mr. Winslow stated that this problem will be worse next year; there needs to be priorities placed on roads and without looking at worse case scenarios there might be less revenue in the County next year, and road problem becomes bigger. He mentioned that he cannot put a dollar figure on the problem now, but dollar figure needs to look at what is needed this year and next year, especially if revenue will be going down in the County. Jim Stivender believes this is a longer term situation than this budget year or next budget year. He advised this fiscal year is being closed out, and the unfunded road program will be a key component shown at the June 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Road Program is a priority list and evolving program (and comfort level for it to happen).

Mr. Stivender advised that Impact Fees will be gone by the fall of 2012, and if you want to continue the program, there is a need to implement alternatives as soon as possible. Mr. Winslow asked how much will be needed a minimum per year, with different growth estimates, etc. He mentioned that concerned him was based on last impact fee study, it would take 200 years to resurface every road within the County. Mr. Stivender advised those numbers have not changed to resurface every road, as it takes a long time and money; it is a matter of prioritizing list of roads as needed. He advised that he is not able to predict roads, but can provide fundable items they have, and the ones they concerns with as they have had requests from Commissioners, Cities and the public to make improvements on particular roads; traffic counts on particular roads are substantial and if not addressed, there will be more issues with these roads. Mr. Winslow stated he is not worried about growth, but worst case would be no growth, as there is still going to be wear and tear on roads. Mr. Stivender mentioned that with 300,000 people using the roads and wearing it out; if no one showed up tomorrow, there would still be program to maintain existing system, and to do enhancements to the existing system because of the 300,000 living here today. Mr. Winslow advised what is being said now compared to past alternative studies, there is a need to find other alternative sources for roads and sooner it is found, the less impact there will be on first, second and third year.



Jim Richardson asked Mr. Stivender even with impact fee money, there is still not enough money to do what is needed for roads, and Mr. Stivender agreed. Mr. Richardson advised that in Fruitland Park they do not have growth, but across city limit line is The Villages (Sumter County,) where there is growth and they are still impacting our roads. Growth still needs to be thought about in these areas. Mr. Stivender mentioned that there will be a list of projects that are increasing in volumes, and have received traffic counts from 2011 and showing an increase for first time in three-four years with more positive than negative in reduction in volume. As traffic occurs, the aging process occurs and enhancements. He has had requests in last three-four years (assuming population has not increased much) for traffic signals (about 25 a year), with actually four-five studies a year. This is tied directly to intersections, which is first line of need of safety enhancements throughout the County. Fortunately, the County was able to get State funds (through a safety grant) to help fund intersection improvements / traffic signal at Mt. Homer Road and David Walker Drive, which allows us to stretch our dollars locally as much as we can.

John Buxman asked Mr. Stivender if he gets any help from the cities (as mentioned before that when the cities annex, they annex everything but the roads). Jim Stivender reported that they are working on program and made a presentation to the BCC on April 12<sup>th</sup> regarding 108-miles of roads that are more than 51% inside the city limits that are considered local roads, and would not fall within the collector road category. He advised they are meeting within the next 6-months with cities to discuss and offering rearrangement of the gas tax, to try and compensate the cities for their growth and annexations (adjusting fees). Most times, cities have deferred to the County on major road issues even though it is a major growth issue between County and cities. Mr. Talmage suggested inviting City Managers to speak to the committee. Mr. Stivender mentioned that cities have a community ideology on how roads affect them; they do not look at a regional aspect of transportation management like the State and County do. The MPO has been a big help in educating the two groups to bring them together.

Mr. Yoakum reported at original meeting when this was presented, there were a lot of technical aspects on how it was calculated, as it was based on projects such as libraries, and not on market prices; seems there should be an adjustment factor, and some calculations are high. He has been to three of these meetings and has not seen any development of action issues after listening to a speaker; someone should be listing key things learned, and should discuss now after today's presentation the top five things learned and need to carry forward for plan. It was reported that it was covered at the last meeting and in the minutes. Mr. Yoakum stated that if it was in the minutes, it should be listed as adjectives as opposed this is what everyone talked about (building an action item), as this is what he has seen in other committees. Chairman Talmage advised the remainder of agenda covers these and a date set aside to discuss everything absorbed.

Alan Winslow reported he understands about concerns of billing cost, but if Impact Fees are going to be a large part of future funding, then we need to take a new look and base it on today's cost and what future projected costs are, which is changing everyday especially in terms of new building costs. Jim Stivender stated that he can assure construction cost numbers that were used are currently what is being bid out now (for example: a project was just bid in South Lake for \$1.5 million and budget was for \$ 2million). Mr. Winslow asked if he is talking about road costs and Mr. Stivender said yes. Mr. Stivender is comfortable with the road cost and seeing since prices have come out, somewhat of an increase because of material costs. Labor costs are still flat and hauling costs are still flat (even with increase of fuel. Contractors are essentially keeping their doors open and this has been going on since 2008. He advised there are two projects he can add that are four-lane projects he just received bids on and compare, but think you will see the exact same numbers as seen two years ago. Mr. Winslow advised he is comfortable with the road costs, but going forward would like projections on what oil prices are doing; the cost of construction is going to be a big impact on revenue.

Jim Richardson stated that he knows the County is looking at the cities to buy in as well, so at his last Fruitland Park Commission meeting he shared his notes with them, and suggested sending information to other City Commissions. Mr. Stivender advised that the information was included in what was sent to the cities last month as one of their tabs, but if it can be sent separately to bring attention to it, this would be fine. Mr. Richardson suggested sending to City Mayors/City Managers. Mr. Richardson asked Jim Stivender about the use of warm asphalt versus hot asphalt (cold-in place), as this is what the City of Fruitland Park is doing and it is much cheaper. Mr. Stivender advised that he has done several hot-in place, cold-in place, and micro-surfacing, as there are different techniques to use. Bill Benham asked if we are comfortable that the Task Force Study has every option available for transportation needs.



Angi Thompson stated she believes this is something they are looking at as a committee, and asked if they want to send the BCC that was done a few years ago that they have already received, or wait and send them what the committee comes up with. Bill Benham advised that there may be some other option to fund transportation other than what is in the Task Force Study. Chairman Talmage suggested their recommendation be added to the Task Force Study after the July meeting. Mr. Benham asked since the Budget has not been finalized, how is it that we cannot get into Budget process this round for collection, and Ms. Thompson stated it is a long process, as it is a year long process.

Mr. Benham questioned why the BCC could not state at next public meeting that they wanted to devote 2% of general fund to transportation and cut here and there – it can be done. Mr. Richardson advised that everything has to be done before the trim notice comes out. Linda Nagle advised that the BCC has a workshop on Monday, June 13<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Thompson reported that she believes the BCC is not expecting a report from the committee as part of this budget process. The initial timeline is 6-months and not expecting a report from the committee until September/October, at which time this year's budget would be in the adoption process. She gets the idea that the committee is not ready to send the BCC a recommendation today that they could use at their next public meeting. Linda Nagle advised she is not sure about that, as from what she has heard from the committee, there is a strong support for 2% devoted to roads from the general fund. Bill Benham mentioned the problem that has been run into on transportation needs for the County, they have relied on an 'unreliable source of revenue' to fulfill the needs of the County which is Impact Fees. General Tax Revenues are a reliable source of revenue.

Mr. Talmage asked if the County is dipping into reserves for the Minneola Park Complex and Bobby Bonilla stated no there were not. Nancy Hurlbert suggested that the committee make the recommendation to the BCC at the budget workshop on Monday, June 13<sup>th</sup>, that 2% from the general fund be devoted to road funds for the 2011/2012 Budget. Alan Winslow mentioned that the alternative funding committee (from three years ago) said that taxpayers would be shocked to realize there is no Ad Valorem Tax money being put into roads; and on top of that Impact Fees will be gone in fall of 2012 (there is a crisis looming and it is not on the radar with the BCC). If this comes up in these hearings, people are going to be upset. He believes the committee needs to make a recommendation to BCC to for budget money going into roads. Jim Richardson stated that main thing the BCC wanted from buy in from the cities on whether one of the committee's recommendations was to implement old option gas tax. Mr. Buxman stated that there two things you cannot project, one being what growth is going to do, and when the Impact Fee suspension ends what is to say that the BCC will not continue the suspension.

Carol McLeod agreed and stated there was a big shock that there was no other funding of roads except Impact Fee money. Bill Benham asked when the BCC phased out monies used from the general fund, and Jim Stivender advised it was phased out in the 1980's. Mr. Stivender advised that one time in 2005 and 2007, he received \$300,000, but when it came to actual funding source, in 1983 or 1984 2% of the general fund was devoted to roads in that particular year, and then implemented impact fees and gas tax after that. Federal Revenue Sharing was used before that for most road projects, but was done away with in the 1970's, as he dealt with the Davis Bacon Act when it came to hiring employees and making sure you had minimum salaries associated with those projects. The 6-cent optional gas tax was not implemented until 1984/1985.

Alan Winslow stated that according to the Task Force Study, the County use to use 8% of Ad Valorem Taxes for road enhancement and road construction. Nancy Hurlbert advised it was 2% per year to get up to 8% (a recommendation from the Task Force). Mr. Stivender advised the County and tax base was much smaller at that time and believes the 8% was \$600,000. Jim Richardson asked what the new numbers are for values of properties, as new values have shown a decline. Ms. Thompson advised that the County Budget Director will be at the next meeting and would have that information. Mr. Stivender mentioned that he prep the budget director and make sure he knows what the 2, 3, 4, and 5 percent numbers would be. Carol McLeod advised that she received a letter from Frank Royce, which showed a reduction from last year of 7.9%. Bill Benham stated that at the last meeting, he asked Commissioner Parks what the budget was for the County and was advised \$109 million. Jim Stivender advised he believes the \$109 million is from General Fund.

Bill Benham presented a motion that the BCC consider a 2% dedication of General Revenue Funds towards transportation needs of the County, without raising the millage rate, for the next fiscal year of 2011/2012. Alan Winslow suggesting to notify the BCC why the committee is requesting this, as the committee sees a big problem on the horizon and raising 'a flag' and getting a start. Linda Nagle asked if it would be better to say that the Task Force recommendation was to phase in 2% per year until they get back to the 8%; she said that we are presenting the 2% now as part of a four-year phase in. Bill Benham asked if he should expand the motion, and Alan Winslow stated at this time they are just trying to 'shock them' and get this on the radar.



Mr. Benham advised that he did not want to raise taxes at any level in this environment, but could expand other sources of revenue. Jim Richardson mentioned that he does not want to raise taxes, but if you stay at the current millage rate it is still considered a tax increase; with property values declining, even with same millage rate, you are not bringing same revenue as last year, and the County has to deal with that shortfall and then add 2% more. Bill Benham stated that this should help the County stimulate and reprioritize how they are spending the money. Mr. Richardson advised unless you go back to the rollback number, it is a tax increase. Mr. Benham advised there is an old saying "there are things I want and things I need" – I definitely need a road I can get to the grocery, but I do not need some other things I see Government supplying. Jim Stivender stated that the General Fund can be used for any transportation uses and asked the committee if they want to be specific in those uses – Capital only? Bill Benham mentioned that he wanted to build roads, and Mr. Stivender advised that needs to be in the motion.

Angi Thompson advised she wanted the committee to hear what she has written down regarding the motion, as this will be going to Commissioner Parks and the committee can tweak it as needed: 'Although they have not completed their entire process, the CFAC felt strongly that they wanted to send a message to the BCC to be considered during this budget process. They see a big problem on the horizon that cannot be defined at this time and the purpose is to raise a flag and make a start'. Bill Benham made a motion that the BCC consider an initial 2% dedication of General Fund Revenues towards the transportation needs of the County, for this next fiscal year, without any corresponding raise in the millage rate. The CFAC anticipates this is just an initial recommendation to be followed by further recommendations as they complete their assigned responsibilities." Bill Benham asked if the committee really wanted to put it the BCC that way – maybe in a harder way. Jim Richardson stated that the motion should include what the money should be allocated for – not road maintenance, but capital improvement.

Angi Thompson stated the motion presented is that the BCC consider an additional 2% dedication of General Fund Revenues towards Capital Facilities Transportation needs of the County for the next fiscal year without any corresponding raise in the millage rate. Ms. Thompson stated that she only added 'towards Capital Facilities'. Carol McLeod advised that in the recommendation, her concern would be from the BCC would be to wait until the committee is done. She feels the motion should be a little stronger. Jim Richardson stated that the committee's urgency is to bring this issue to the BCC now, this fiscal year, and will still finish their task. Jim Stivender mentioned had he not had the ARRA money that was used for resurfacing roads that were just done he would be really concerned about the number of road miles to be resurfaced. Bill Benham asked Mr. Stivender what supplemental money he receives for roads, other than relying on impact fees, gas taxes, and Mr. Stivender advised sales tax. Mr. Benham asked if he receives federal money, state money comes in to build roads – percentage wise 1/3, 1/4, and Mr. Stivender it was not near that and does not know the number right now. Mr. Stivender stated that the County works directly with FDOT (Deland) with their safety program, where most of the County's monies comes from for traffic lights and paved shoulders; Millions of dollars have been received over from the years from FDOT, but Mr. Stivender has not calculated the percentage of total capital program. Bill Benham asked how our local legislation delegation in recruiting those types of monies, and Mr. Stivender advised that since they have been downsizing their budgets, he has not gone to legislation and asked for safety funds, as a lot of that comes from federal.

Angi Thompson read the following revised draft BCC recommendation to the committee for their input: "Although they have not completed their entire process, the CFAC felt strongly that they wanted to send a message to the BCC to be considered during this budget process. They see a big problem on the horizon that cannot be even be fully defined as this time. This is to raise a flag and make a start. They do not want to wait until future budget years to begin making changes. The CFAC adopted a motion that the BCC consider an initial 2% dedication of General Fund revenues towards the capital facilities transportation needs of the County for this next fiscal year, without any corresponding raise in the millage rate. The CFAC strongly recommends the BCC implement this recommendation in this budget process. Further recommendations will be forthcoming as they complete their assigned responsibilities." It was suggested to remove wording of 'this fiscal year' to '2011-2012'. Linda Nagle suggested in sentence stating 'they see a big problem on the horizon that cannot be 'even'...', remove 'be even. Ms. Thompson advised once the committee has approved the motion, she will send this to Commissioner Parks and copying the County Attorney's office and committee. Bill Benham advised he feels the committee understands what they are asking the BCC to do and asked for the motion to approve, which was seconded by Nancy Hurlbert. Chairman Talmage asked all those in favor for adopting the motion to be sent to the BCC to say 'I' and those opposed which was none and unanimously carried.

Jim Richardson asked for next meeting, the committee needs to know what the reduction in property values are for the County and what the 2% represents. Bill Benham stated that he wants to know what the 2% dollar amount represents and how much of a shortfall the committee will have in finding funding sources for. Angi Thompson asked the committee to verify what they need the Budget Director to provide at the next meeting.



Mr. Benham asked the maximum amount of impact fees that was raised in a fiscal year for transportation, and Mr. Stivender advised under \$20 million countywide in 2005. Mr. Benham asked the year before impact fees were suspended, how much impact fees were received and Mr. Stivender advised it was less than \$5 million. Alan Winslow stated this was in Mr. Stivender's presentation and it would be nice to send the presentation out again. Mr. Buxman asked if the recommendation presented from the Alternative Task Force, after all the work that was done did no one pay attention to it, and advised that the impact fee committee did send a recommendation to the board for 3%. Ms. Thompson advised the June 1<sup>st</sup> estimate of the general County property values would be forwarded to the committee members.

Bill Benham advised that the Fire fee comparison is out of whack and if he had his way, he would suspend all fees until everything turns around. Carol McLeod mentioned one of the things the school district looks at (comparing to Marion County since they are about the same size), is that Marion County has not grown in 10-years and had 40,000 students' ten-years ago, and not looking at the same picture. Bill Benham stated in the current Fire Fee comparison, the retail commercial/office was hit hard on a 1,000 foot basis, which throws the chart out of balance. Mr. Buxman suggested making make the fees are more general and simplifier for everyone involved. Jim Richardson asked how much did the Duncan study cost and Ms. Thompson stated approx. \$100,000. Mr. Benham asked there was a cost for Mr. Muller to come today and show the presentation and Ms. Thompson stated yes, but this was part of their contract and Duncan & Associates will send a bill as they provide services. Mr. Benham asked approximately how much the presentation cost and Ms. Thompson stated approx. \$1,500-\$2,500. Linda Nagle suggested that when the bill comes in for his presentation, that the amount of time he spent that he personally said was his soapbox as that is how he makes his living, should be subtracted from his bill. Bill Benham asked who the first advisor on impact fees and Ms. Thompson advised there were Tindale & Oliver and then Henderson Young who did the school study. Mr. Benham mentioned it might have been Henderson Young, but whomever, he wants to hear simply the facts – amount charged and how it number is driven, and comparison with other counties.

Nancy Hurlbert suggested making a recommendation that their recommendation of land use categories be scaled down. Ms. Thompson suggested keeping in mind that transportation fees are not being collected now due to suspension. Nancy Hurlbert suggested making a recommendation to adoption of revised land use categories, as recommended by the consultant, Duncan & Associates. Mr. Benham stated that would cure the fire fee. Ms. Thompson advised the committee to be aware if sending to the BCC, as this is a significant change to the ordinance and must go through process to make it happen. Nancy Hurlbert made recommendation to that the process for ordinance be adopted to adopt the land use recommendation, as outlined in the Duncan report, to reduce the number of land use recommendations. Ms. Thompson reiterated 'to adopt the collapsed land use categories' and Bill Benham seconded the recommendation. Angi Thompson advised if the committee is making motions to consider changes, the BCC has already had discussions about changing the number of benefit districts, then if sending recommendation of adoption to the ordinance, do they want to include reducing the benefit districts at the same time? Bill Benham asked if the benefit districts are only part of the transportation piece and advised yes, but Ms. Thompson stated this can still happen. The committee advised they would like for this to be two separate motions.

Angi Thompson clarified that the committee wanted to change the ordinance to adopt the collapsed land uses for road and fire, and Mr. Benham asked if this was another motion and Ms. Thompson stated no. Ms. Thompson advised road and fire are on the commercial fee schedule and apply to residential as well. Ms. Hurlbert asked why just the two fees and not all of them. Ms. Thompson advised road and fire are the only ones that those land uses apply to, because park and school are specifically for residential. The school fees come from the school board. Mr. Benham asked if the committee adopted the new proposed land use categories, would it reduce the fire fee for retail/commercial and office – if collapsing the category, does it affect the rate? Mr. Buxman asked if you can consolidate all into one general category and Ms. Thompson advised that poses a problem as the fee schedule is based on the 83 different land uses, she cannot administer the impact fee program if she has land uses that do not apply to the adoptive. Melanie Marsh clarified that if she would re-write the ordinance and take all listed categories, they would become headers and reorganize under these headers, because what their consultant is saying is to collapse down and have one fee for public institution – we are not adopting fees. She cannot write an ordinance, other than making a header putting all under public institution and taking the same fees and moving them over. Bill Benham asked Ms. Hurlbert what her primary motion was and she stated to adjust the fire fees.



Melanie Marsh advised if the committee wants to reduce the fees, the BCC must adopt the fees. She can write the ordinance and the BCC can adopt the new fees as part of it, but just changing the categories without the associated fees is not going to get you where you want to be. Chairman Talmage suggested noting this and bringing a larger recommendation to the BCC. Ms. Hurlbert stated it was a shame that the committee did not get Fire, Library and Parks adopted at the different rate before. Mr. Benham advised that one of the reasons there is discussion at this meeting is because the next meeting will be going into other areas and have concentrated this meeting on Impact Fee and is why it has come up today – it need to be adjusted, but be premature, as they do not have the big picture as of yet. Jim Richardson asked if it would be easier to make it the final part of the committee's mission, and Ms. Thompson stated that was up to the committee, but the committee's focus right now is transportation. But if you want to make a change to Fire, Park and Library, because they have heard the study and formed an opinion, you can send a recommendation to the BCC, to adopt the Fire, Park, Library and Administrative portion of the study, and deal with the road separately as part of bigger picture. Bill Benham asked Nancy Hurlbert if this was her motion and said yes. Jim Richardson suggested in order not to bombard the BCC with motions, to stick with the 2% and make this one of the final recommendations.

Nancy Hurlbert stated all concentration from this part forward is on transportation, and why not get Fire, Parks and Library out of the way now. It was asked if annual adjustment (based on inflation, etc.) and Angi Thompson stated that was part of the Administrative part of it. She mentioned that if the committee wanted to include Fire, Parks, Library and Administrative portion of the study, would address rates for all three, and address collapsed land use categories for Fire only, address indexing, administrative fee per permit and benefit districts. The only thing left of that study would be the rate of the Road Impact Fee, which can be addressed as part of larger capital facilities' oversight. Linda Nagle agreed with Jim Richardson to send the important motion to the BCC is significant, since the committee will be meeting again in two-weeks, which will give them time to come back and discuss. The priority should be on what the committee's motion that has already passed and do not want to muddle that message by adding another message to it at this time. Angi Thompson advised if the committee makes the second motion, it will not get to the BCC at the same time or before the other one, as there is background staff work she needs to do to get it on BCC's regular meeting. Ms. Thompson advised that the information to be presented by Commissioner Parks to the BCC workshop has already been sent to him. The second motion would have to go on regular BCC agenda and would not happen until sometime in July. Bill Benham asked if it takes that long to revise the ordinance and advised yes and would take takes approx. three weeks to get on agenda to process.

Jim Richardson advised that the committee also talked about adding \$142 fee (versus \$24 fee collected now). Angi Thompson stated currently it is 3% on whatever Impact Fees are collected at a maximum of \$100, but since the County is only collecting Fire, Park and Library on a standard single-family permit, that is \$803 dollars and 3% of that is \$24.09 and not recouping costs under current administrative program. Ms. Thompson advised that the reason it went to 3% (with maximum of \$100), because it use to be 3% only and came out of Impact Fee and a large commercial permit, that 3% could be a lot of money; however, on a residential permit (usually \$10,000 to \$12,000) it was less. To even the playing field, they made it the 3% maximum and in addition to the Impact Fee so the money would not be taken out of what was going into the Impact Fee Trust Funds. Nancy Hurlbert moved the CFAC recommended the 2010 Impact Fee (recommended by Duncan & Associates) for Fire, Library and Parks along with the Administration recommendation. Bill Benham seconded the motion and Chairman Talmage opened it up for discussion. Mr. Benham stated the only thing he has had a problem with (while on this committee) is how we put value on costs of roads, homes and how they drive the fee and generate it; periodically update through presentation, but for comment purposes only, to address every 6-months for revision of fee or written into ordinance.

Angi Thompson stated that what could be done is similar to what Schools do (update every three years); we do not have that same time requirement for any of the other fee studies, but could say we have to update every certain number of years. Bill Benham stated for example the price of an acre of park land (as prices are up and down), he remembered when the original park recommendation, he had to ask how much park property was donated and how much acquired through State (for example PEAR Park); and after asking those questions, it lowered the Park Impact Fee by half. Ms. Thompson advised that the update he is talking about is not something staff can do periodically. Mr. Benham asked for a land cost, can it come out of Ed Havill's office – Property Appraiser. Ms. Hurlbert asked if the administrative costs could that not be considered the annual inflation adjustment (incorporating the annual adjustment), and Ms. Thompson stated that is part of the administrative portion recommended for adoption, and if the index goes down, the fee would go down. Mr. Benham advised that he is concerned on the accuracy of the fees in general, as he sees things that raise a red flag including calculation; can this study be pegged to something that is generated independently? Only the Engineering News Report, which was recommended for construction costs and is national. Carol McLeod advised that no matter when reports are done, they are outdated when you get them; that is why the School has the three-year built in (you have to go on actual cost – what a school was built for three years ago is not what it is going to cost today. Angi Thompson advised that if you re-commission a new study every three years,



you will pay the full cost, but last time this was done it was over \$200,000 and this time was \$100,000. Mr. Buxman asked we ask to have the study updated every three years, will we recoup the fees. Alan Winslow stated is what is responsible – to generate revenue or some type of fairness, and Mr. Benham stated it is to make things equitable. Mr. Winslow stated one cost is going up and another cost is going down. Chairman Talmage asked if there is any more discussion on the motion and Ms. Thompson asked if she could clarify if she has the motions correctly and read: 'Send forth Fire, Park, Library and Administration portions of the study for adoption as presented and recommended by Duncan and Associates'. Carol McLeod asked to clarify the motion include the changes to the Land Use Categories and advised it was part of the motion. Linda Nagle asked if this was for the full rate recommendation and Ms. Thompson stated it would be for 100%, and the last time this committee recommended it at 100%, which was noted it was for Parks, Fire and Library and not for Transportation. Jim Richardson clarified that the committee is recommending a flat \$142 fee and not the 1.3% of fees. Ms. Thompson stated that this is just a recommendation and the BCC can change it, lower it, or whatever they wish to do. When this study was voted by the Impact Fee Committee last year, they recommended for those three at 100%.

If the CFAC approves it, the County Attorney's office would draft an ordinance and then have Duncan and Associates come back and present to the BCC and then go through the public hearing process, which will take some time to happen and eliminate concerns for overlapping priorities. Linda Nagle asked would it not be up to the BCC if they want Duncan to present it, and Ms. Thompson stated that Duncan would only present the portions of the study the CFAC is voting on. Ms. Nagle advised for those that are concerned about the cost spent for having Duncan come back, it is being doubled now, as they are coming back two separate times. Melanie Marsh advised the County Attorney's office would have to review their contract with Duncan and Associates, to see if it is a lump sum, hourly or included and will have to review it. Ms. Thompson advised that Duncan and Associates presenting to the BCC was included in their contract. She could not take the motion to the BCC without bringing Duncan and Associates back, as it is not an option. Mr. Benham asked if that would be another \$25,000 and Ms. Thompson said it would be somewhere between \$1,500 to \$2,500. Mr. Benham advised that he remembered hearing that when a consultant was hired, the main re-calculation contained a certain amount of meetings and might not cost extra. Ms. Nagle advised that she also remembered when asked to have Duncan come back to this meeting, there was money set aside to go to the BCC, but had already been to the committee and would not come back to the committee. Chairman Talmage moved to take a vote on adopting the Land Use recommendation from the Duncan report, for all those in favor to single by saying 'I' and those opposed say 'Nay' – with Linda Nagle opposing. Ms. Thompson asked who motioned and advised Nancy Hurlbert and asked who seconded, which was Bill Benham. Alan Winslow advised that he had abstained from vote, but it was advised he cannot unless there is a conflict of interest. Ms. Thompson asked if the vote needs to be redone and Mr. Winslow advised no he would go along with this vote.

Angi Thompson stated before the committee adjourned, she would like to go over the upcoming schedule because there is a need to advertise one month in advance for these meetings. Currently, there are meetings scheduled for June 30<sup>th</sup>, July 7<sup>th</sup>, July 21<sup>st</sup> (Jim Stivender cannot attend, but will have staff present to answer questions); do you need to schedule extra meetings as you think you might need them, or do you want to resume the quarterly schedule so she can make sure the meetings are advertised appropriately. Alan Winslow mentioned to be safe he would add another meeting after June 30<sup>th</sup>. Linda Nagle asked when the new meeting date would be and advised it would be August 4<sup>th</sup>. Bill Bonham asked what denotes the completion of the committee's task, and Ms. Thompson advised sending the committee's recommendation to the BCC, but ask they keep in mind that their task included transportation and schools and not sure when the school meetings will begin. Carol McLeod advised that the school just scheduled with Henderson Young the other day and would get the date to Angi. Bill Bonham stated that outside of a few bits of information, the committee needs to get a full scope of transportation encompass, and the meetings with the school on what Henderson Young's review of Impact Fees; Carol McLeod advised that the County had suspended School Impact Fees. Mr. Bonham stated outside of the budget, the committee's recommendation in this fiscal year, is to review every other piece the Task Force came up with and any other ideas that may come up, the committee has done all they can do. Jim Richardson asked if it would make sense and to save money, to go to the school workshop board when the school Impact Fee presentation is made, and Ms. McLeod agreed. Mr. Bonham asked when that date would be and Ms. McLeod advised it is early August, but would have to check on the date. Mr. Bonham suggested recommending the workshop be the committee's meeting.



Ms. McLeod advised she believes the school board contract includes the consultant presenting to the BCC and the CFAC, but would have to check the contract. She will check the date and Ms. Thompson will notify the committee and if the committee plans to go to the meeting, she will need to advertise. Ms. McLeod stated that most school board meetings are Monday afternoons, but would check the date and email to Angi when she gets back to her office. Ms. Thompson asked what the school board's policy on public participation and Ms. McLeod stated that the school board would be open for attendance, especially with this type of topic and the committee would be in attendance.

Nancy Hulbert asked Jim Stivender that he had implied there were other avenues of funding that were not necessarily incorporated in the Task Force Alternative Study, and Mr. Stivender advised that he addressed all legal alternatives except the General Fund, but the committee has all the legal alternatives.

Chairman Talmage asked for a motion for the committee to adjourn; Bill Benham motioned to adjourn and was seconded by Jeffrey Banker.

Mr. Talmage adjourned the meeting at 12:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Cheryl Sutherland  
Office Associate III



Davis Talmage  
CFAC Chairman